

### REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, and 9-15 are presently active, claims 2, 4, 6, and 8 having been cancelled without prejudice by this Amendment.

In the Office Action dated 14 May 2003 ("Office Action"), claims 1, 3, 5 and 9 were objected to because "PHY" and "MAC" were not spelled out, claims 13-14 were objected to because "BIOS" was not spelled out, and claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Arnett, et al., "Inside TCP/IP", 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 1995 ("Arnett").

Claims 1, 3, 5, 9, and 13-14 are amended to spell out "PHY", "MAC", and/or "BIOS".

To better define the invention, claim 1 is amended to include the limitation of claim 2; claim 3 is amended to include the limitation of claim 4, claim 5 is amended to include the limitation of claim 6. Accordingly, claims 2, 4, 6, and 8 aren't needed and are cancelled. Claim 9 is amended to include the limitation that "the PHY-to-MAC words and the MAC-to-PHY words are synchronized into pairs, where a pair comprises one PHY-to-MAC word and one MAC-to-PHY word." No new matter has been added because this claim limitation of synchronized pairs was present in original claim 2. With this Amendment, each independent claim now includes the limitation of synchronized pairs.

Applicants believe that Arnett does not teach the limitation of synchronized pairs as recited in the presently active claims. It should be noted that the PHY and MAC of the present invention, as should be clear from the specification, belong to the same protocol stack. The use of PHY-to-MAC words and MAC-to-PHY words allow the PHY and MAC to exchange information with each other so that each MAC-to-PHY word is synchronized with a PHY-to-MAC word. That is, information between the PHY and MAC is exchanged via a pair of words, where each pair comprises one PHY-to-MAC word and one MAC-to-PHY word.

The "synchronization" as taught in page 12 of Arnett is the synchronization between a transmitter and a receiver. The transmitter and receiver of Arnett are not part

of the same protocol stack. Consequently, Arnett does not teach all of the claim limitations.

Respectfully submitted,

Seth Z. Kalson Dated: Oct 14, 2003

Seth Z. Kalson  
Reg. no. 40,670  
Attorney for Intel Corporation (Assignee)

OFFICIAL

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 15 2003